

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 7-14, 16, 21-28, 30, 32-33 and 35-36 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 16, 28, 32, 33, 35 and 36 being independent. Claims 1-3, 7-14, 16, 21-28, 30, 32-33 and 35-36 are currently amended. Claims 4-6, 15, 17-20, 29, 31 and 34 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited herein. The original disclosure supports the amendments. No new matter has been added. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Cited References

- **Graham:** Graham et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,582,475
- **Stern:** Stern, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0038840
- **Wolpe:** Wolpe, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174144

§103 Rejections

- Claims 1-3, 5-20, 24-30 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Stern
- Claims 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Stern and in further view of Wolpe

Claims 1-3, 7-14, 16, 24-28, 30, 32-33, and 35-36

Claims **1-3, 7-14, 16, 24-28, 30, 32-33, and 35-36** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Stern.

Claim 1

As amended, independent **claim 1** recites:

A computer implemented system that facilitates building a profile of a user comprising:

 a processor communicatively coupled to a memory, said memory having stored thereon computer-executable instructions configured to implement the profile building system including:

 at least one extraction component to extract semantic components of at least one portion of a web page;

 at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page, to receive the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons; and

 a profile component to populate and store the profile of the user and to indicate the user's selection of the one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons for viewing by the user or other users.

The instant application is directed generally towards conveying user information between and among users to create a collaborative filtering environment with maintained user privacy. Graham describes an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form for printing automatically annotated documents based upon concepts of interest to a particular user (Graham, Abstract and col. 3, lines 25-27). The annotations denote

text relevant to user-selected concepts (Graham, col. 3, lines 66-67). Furthermore, a series of concept indicators 206 permit the user to view concepts of interest to the user to be noted in the document (Graham, col. 4, lines 47-53). By selecting a concept add button 808, the user may add a new concept to her profile for identifying concepts of to be noted in a document, *id.* Accordingly, a print dialog 200 enables the user to obtain printed copies of sections of an electronic document having the greatest relevance to the concepts of interest to the user (Graham, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham does not teach or suggest, at least, “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office’s citation purporting to teach the foregoing is incorrect. As mentioned above, the concept indicators described in Graham permit a user to indicate which concepts of interest are to be noted in a document, not “automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page,” as recited in claim 1. In other words, the concept add buttons 808 in Graham instruct the system to annotate selected concepts in a document, if any, while the “user interface buttons,” recited in claim 1 automatically reflect context of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page. Moreover, the Office acknowledges that Graham does not teach that “the features automatically present information to the user,” and looks to Stern to rectify this deficiency (Office Action, pg. 5).

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern fails to rectify the deficiencies of Graham since Stern fails to teach or suggest, at least “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, Stern describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner (Abstract). The Office’s cited portion from Stern describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, “The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user’s profile accordingly (Stern, [0055]). Also, “the system will extract such information and update the user’s intelligent profile accordingly” *id.* In this manner, the user’s profile in Stern will contain parameters related to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly or *interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic,*” *id.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern does not teach or suggest, at least, “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham and Stern, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 1. In addition, there is no motivation to

combine these references. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Graham and Stern.

Claims 2-3 and **7-14** depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration for each dependent claim.

Claim 16

As amended, independent **claim 16** recites:

A computer-implemented method that facilitates creating user profile comprising:

extracting from a web page semantic components of at least one portion of the web page;

providing one or more input components comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page;

receiving the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons; and

populating the user profile with the user's selection of the one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons for viewing by the user or other users.

As provided above with respect to claim 1, the instant application is directed generally towards conveying user information between and among users to create a collaborative filtering environment with maintained user privacy. Graham describes an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form for printing automatically annotated documents based upon concepts of interest to a particular user (Graham, Abstract and col. 3, lines 25-27). The annotations denote text relevant to user-selected concepts (Graham, col. 3,

lines 66-67). Furthermore, a series of concept indicators 206 permit the user to view concepts of interest to the user to be noted in the document (Graham, col. 4, lines 47-53). By selecting a concept add button 808, the user may add a new concept to her profile for identifying concepts of to be noted in a document, *id.* Accordingly, a print dialog 200 enables the user to obtain printed copies of sections of an electronic document having the greatest relevance to the concepts of interest to the user (Graham, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham does not teach or suggest, at least “providing one or more input components comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 16. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office’s citation purporting to teach the foregoing is incorrect. As mentioned above, the concept indicators described in Graham permit a user to indicate which concepts of interest are to be noted in a document, not “automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page,” as recited in claim 16. In other words, the concept add buttons 808 in Graham instruct the system to annotate selected concepts in a document, if any, while the “user interface buttons,” recited in claim 16 automatically reflect context of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page. Moreover, the Office acknowledges that Graham does not teach that “the features automatically present information to the user,” and looks to Stern to rectify this deficiency (Office Action, pp. 5 and 8).

But, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern fails to rectify the deficiencies of Graham since Stern fails to teach or suggest, at least “providing one or more input components,

the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 16. Rather, Stern describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner (Stern, Abstract). The Office’s cited portion from Stern describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, “The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user’s profile accordingly (Stern, [0055]). Also, “the system will extract such information and update the user’s intelligent profile accordingly” *id.* In this manner, the user’s profile in Stern will contain parameters related to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly or *interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic,*” *id.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern does not teach or suggest, at least, “providing one or more input components, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 16.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham and Stern, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, “providing one or more input components, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 16. In addition,

there is no motivation to combine these references. Accordingly, claim 16 is patentable over the combination of Graham and Stern.

Claims 24-27 depend from independent claim 16 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration for each dependent claim.

Claim 28

As amended, independent **claim 28** recites:

A computer-implemented method that facilitates conveying information about a user to other users, comprising:

browsing information stored on a web page;

selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on selecting one or more of a plurality of use interface buttons that automatically reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page;

populating a user's personal profile with the at least one declaration; and

selectively sharing the user's personal profile with the other users.

As mentioned above with respect to claims 1 and 16, the instant application is directed generally towards conveying user information between and among users to create a collaborative filtering environment with maintained user privacy. Graham describes an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form for printing automatically annotated documents based upon concepts of interest to a particular user (Graham, Abstract and col. 3, lines 25-27). The annotations denote text relevant to user-selected concepts (Graham, col. 3, lines 66-67). Furthermore, a series of concept indicators

206 permit the user to view concepts of interest to the user to be noted in the document (Graham, col. 4, lns 47-53). By selecting a concept add button 808, the user may add a new concept to her profile for identifying concepts of to be noted in a document, *id.* Accordingly, a print dialog 200 enables the user to obtain printed copies of sections of an electronic document having the greatest relevance to the concepts of interest to the user (Graham, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham does not teach or suggest, at least, “selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on selecting one or more of a plurality of use interface buttons that automatically reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page,” as recited in claim 28. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office’s citation purporting to teach the foregoing is incorrect. As mentioned above, the concept indicators described in Graham permit a user to indicate which concepts of interest are to be noted in a document, not “automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page,” as recited in claim 28. In other words, the concept add buttons 808 in Graham instruct the system to annotate selected concepts in a document, if any, while the “user interface buttons,” recited in claim 28 automatically reflect context of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page. Moreover, the Office acknowledges that Graham does not teach that “the features automatically present information to the user,” and looks to Stern to rectify this deficiency (Office Action, pp. 5 and 8).

But, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern fails to rectify the deficiencies of Graham since Stern fails to teach or suggest, at least “selectively making at least one

declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality of user interface buttons that automatically reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page,” as recited in claim 28. Rather, Stern describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner (Abstract). The Office’s cited portion describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, “The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user’s profile accordingly (Stern, [0055]). Also, “the system will extract such information and update the user’s intelligent profile accordingly,” *id.* In this manner, the user’s profile in Stern will contain parameters related to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly or *interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic*,” *id.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern does not teach or suggest, at least, “selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality of user interface buttons that automatically reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page,” as recited in claim 28.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham and Stern, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, “selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality of user interface buttons that automatically reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page,” as recited in claim 28. In addition, there is no motivation to combine these references. Accordingly, claim 28 is patentable over the combination of Graham and Stern.

Claim 30 depends from independent claim 28 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration for this dependent claim.

Claim 32

As amended, independent **claim 32** recites:

A computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon the following computer executable components:

at least one extraction component to extract semantic components of at least one portion of a web page;

at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page to receive the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons; and

a profile component to populate and store a profile of the user to indicate the user's selection of the one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons for viewing by the user or others.

Graham describes an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form for printing automatically annotated documents based upon concepts of interest to a particular user (Graham, Abstract and col. 3, lines 25-27). The annotations denote text relevant to user-selected concepts (Graham, col. 3, lines 66-67). Furthermore, a series of concept indicators 206 permit the user to view concepts of interest to the user to be noted in the document (Graham, col. 4, lines 47-53). By selecting a concept add button 808, the user may add a new concept to her profile for identifying concepts of to be noted in a document, *id.* Accordingly, a print dialog 200 enables the user to obtain printed copies of sections of an

electronic document having the greatest relevance to the concepts of interest to the user (Graham, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham does not teach or suggest, at least “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 32. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office’s citation to Graham purporting to teach the foregoing is incorrect. As mentioned above, the concept indicators described in Graham permit a user to indicate which concepts of interest are to be noted in a document, not “automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page,” as recited in claim 32. In other words, the concept add buttons 808 in Graham instruct the system to annotate selected concepts in a document, if any, while the “user interface buttons,” recited in claim 32 automatically reflect context of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page. Moreover, the Office acknowledges that Graham does not teach that “the features automatically present information to the user,” and looks to Stern to rectify this deficiency (Office Action, pp. 5 and 9).

But, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern fails to rectify the deficiencies of Graham since Stern fails to teach or suggest, at least “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 32. Rather, Stern describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some

manner (Stern, Abstract). The Office's cited portion describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, "The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user's profile accordingly (Stern, [0055]). Also, "the system will extract such information and update the user's intelligent profile accordingly," *Id.* In this manner, the user's profile in Stern will contain parameters related to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly or *interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic," id.* Accordingly, Stern does not teach or suggest, at least, "at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page..., " as recited in claim 32.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that Graham and Stern, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, "at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page..., " as recited in claim 32. In addition, there is no motivation to combine these references. Accordingly, claim 32 is patentable over the combination of Graham and Stern.

Claim 33

As amended, independent **claim 33** recites:

A computer-implemented system that facilitates creating user profile comprising:

means for providing at least one extraction component extracting semantic components of at least one portion of a web page;

means for providing one or more input components comprising a plurality of user interface buttons that automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page receiving the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons; and

means for populating and storing the user profile indicating the user's selection of the one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons for viewing by the user or other users.

Graham describes an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form for printing automatically annotated documents based upon concepts of interest to a particular user (Graham, Abstract and col. 3, lines 25-27). The annotations denote text relevant to user-selected concepts (Graham, col. 3, lines 66-67). Furthermore, a series of concept indicators 206 permit the user to view concepts of interest to the user to be noted in the document (Graham, col. 4, lines 47-53). By selecting a concept add button 808, the user may add a new concept to her profile for identifying concepts of to be noted in a document, *id.* Accordingly, a print dialog 200 enables the user to obtain printed copies of sections of an electronic document having the greatest relevance to the concepts of interest to the user (Graham, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham does not teach or suggest, at least "means for providing one or more input components comprising a plurality of user interface buttons that automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page receiving the user's

selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons,” as recited in claim 33. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office’s citation purporting to teach the foregoing is incorrect. As mentioned above, the concept indicators described in Graham permit a user to indicate which concepts of interest are to be noted in a document, not “automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page,” as recited in claim 33. In other words, the concept add buttons 808 in Graham instruct the system to annotate selected concepts in a document, if any, while the “user interface buttons,” recited in claim 33 automatically reflect context of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page. Moreover, the Office acknowledges that Graham does not teach that “the features automatically present information to the user,” and looks to Stern to rectify this deficiency (Office Action, pp. 5 and 9).

But, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern fails to rectify the deficiencies of Graham since Stern fails to teach or suggest, at least “means for providing one or more input components comprising a plurality of user interface buttons that automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page receiving the user’s selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons,” as recited in claim 33. Rather, Stern describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner (Stern, Abstract). The Office’s cited portion describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, “The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user’s profile accordingly (Stern, [0055]). Also, “the system will extract such information and update the

user's intelligent profile accordingly," *id.* In this manner, the user's profile in Stern will contain parameters related to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly or *interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic," id.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern does not teach or suggest, at least, "a means for providing one or more input components, the input components comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page," as recited in claim 33.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham and Stern, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, "means for providing one or more input components comprising a plurality of user interface buttons that automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page receiving the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons," as recited in claim 33. In addition, there is no motivation to combine these references. Accordingly, claim 33 is patentable over the combination of Graham and Stern.

Claim 35

As amended, independent **claim 35** recites:

A computer-implemented system that facilitates conveying information about a user to other users, comprising:

a processor communicatively coupled to a memory, said memory having stored thereon computer-executable instructions configured to implement the system for conveying information about the user to others including:

means for browsing information stored on a web page;

means for selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality of user interface buttons that reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page;

means for populating user's personal profile with the at least one declaration; and

means for selectively sharing the user's personal profile with the users.

Graham describes an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form for printing automatically annotated documents based upon concepts of interest to a particular user (Graham, Abstract and col. 3, lines 25-27). The annotations denote text relevant to user-selected concepts (Graham, col. 3, lines 66-67). Furthermore, a series of concept indicators 206 permit the user to view concepts of interest to the user to be noted in the document (Graham, col. 4, lns 47-53). By selecting a concept add button 808, the user may add a new concept to her profile for identifying concepts of to be noted in a document, *id.* Accordingly, a print dialog 200 enables the user to obtain printed copies of sections of an electronic document having the greatest relevance to the concepts of interest to the user (Graham, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham does not teach or suggest, at least “means for selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality of user interface buttons that reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page,” as recited in claim 35. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office’s citation to Graham purporting to teach the foregoing is incorrect. As mentioned above, the concept indicators described in Graham permit a user to indicate which concepts of interest are to be noted in a document, not “automatically reflecting context to the

user of the web page,” as recited in claim 35. In other words, the concept add buttons 808 in Graham instruct the system to annotate selected concepts in a document, if any, while the “user interface buttons,” recited in claim 35 automatically reflect context of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page. Moreover, the Office acknowledges that Graham does not teach that “the features automatically present information to the user,” and looks to Stern to rectify this deficiency (Office Action, pp. 5 and 9).

But, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern fails to rectify the deficiencies of Graham since Stern fails to teach or suggest, at least “means for selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality of user interface buttons that reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page” as recited in claim 35. Rather, Stern describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner. (Stern, Abstract). The Office’s cited portion describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, “The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user’s profile accordingly (Stern, [0055]). Also, “the system will extract such information and update the user’s intelligent profile accordingly,” *id.* In this manner, the user’s profile in Stern will contain parameters related to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly or *interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic*,” *id.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern does not teach or suggest, at least, “means for selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality

of user interface buttons that reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page,” as recited in claim 35.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham and Stern, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, “means for selectively making at least one declaration about at least one portion of the web page based at least in part on a plurality of user interface buttons that reflect context of the at least one portion of the web page,” as recited in claim 35. In addition, there is no motivation to combine these references. Accordingly, claim 35 is patentable over the combination of Graham and Stern.

Claim 36

As amended, independent **claim 36** recites:

A computer implemented system that facilitates building a profile comprising:

a processor communicatively coupled to a memory, said memory having stored thereon computer-executable instructions configured to implement the profile building system including:

at least one extraction component to extract semantic components of at least one portion of a web page;

at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page receiving the user’s selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons;

wherein the plurality of user interface buttons at least in part relate to at least one of an emotional response of the user, an experience of the user, a desire of the user, a philosophy of the user, a preference of the user, a goal of the user, an opinion of the user, relevance to the user, a theology of the user, an insight of the user, and a conception of the user; and

a profile component to populate and store the profile of the user, indicating the user's selection of the one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons for viewing by the user or other users.

Graham describes an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form for printing automatically annotated documents based upon concepts of interest to a particular user (Graham, Abstract and col. 3, lines 25-27). The annotations denote text relevant to user-selected concepts (Graham, col. 3, lines 66-67). Furthermore, a series of concept indicators 206 permit the user to view concepts of interest to the user to be noted in the document (Graham, col. 4, lines 47-53). By selecting a concept add button 808, the user may add a new concept to her profile for identifying concepts of to be noted in a document, *id.* Accordingly, a print dialog 200 enables the user to obtain printed copies of sections of an electronic document having the greatest relevance to the concepts of interest to the user (Graham, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham does not teach or suggest, at least "at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page..." as recited in claim 36. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office's citation to Graham purporting to teach the foregoing is incorrect. As mentioned above, the concept indicators described in Graham permit a user to indicate which concepts of interest are to be noted in a document, not "automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page," as recited in claim 36. In other words, the concept add buttons 808 in Graham instruct the system to annotate selected concepts in a

document, if any, while the “user interface buttons,” recited in claim 36 automatically reflect context of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page. Moreover, the Office acknowledges that Graham does not teach that “the features automatically present information to the user,” and looks to Stern to rectify this deficiency. (Office Action, pp. 5 and 9).

But, Applicant respectfully submits that Stern fails to rectify the deficiencies of Graham since Stern fails to teach or suggest, at least “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 36. Rather, Stern describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner. (Stern, Abstract). The Office’s cited portion describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, “The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user’s profile accordingly (Stern, [0055]). Also, “the system will extract such information and update the user’s intelligent profile accordingly,” *id.* In this manner, the user’s profile in Stern will contain parameters related to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly or *interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic,*” *id.* Accordingly, Stern does not teach or suggest, at least, “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 36.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Graham and Stern, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, “at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 36. In addition, there is no motivation to combine these references. Accordingly, claim 36 is patentable over the combination of Graham and Stern.

Claims 21-23

Claims 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Stern and in further view of Wolpe. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Dependent claims 21 – 23 are patentable over the proposed combination of Graham and Stern and Wolpe by virtue of its dependency from claim 16 as provided above, as well as for the additional features that they recite. In addition, Wolpe fails to cure the deficiencies of Graham and Stern. Specifically, Wolpe describes a system for personalizing a document by retrieving a message with a change point which is a word/phrase which may be substituted for other words/phrases by a user to slightly alter a message or enhance its meaning (Wolpe, Abstract). As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Wolpe fails to teach or suggest, at least “providing one or more input components, the input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons automatically reflecting context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page...,” as recited in claim 16.

For at least the foregoing reasons, over Graham and Stern in further view of Wolpe whether taken alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 16. In addition, there is no motivation to combine these references. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration for each dependent claim.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 7-14, 16, 21-28, 30, 32-33 and 35-36 are in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. However, if there are any remaining matters that may be handled by a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: June 1, 2010

By: /Don H. Min 55,933/
Don H. Min
Reg No. 55933
206-876-6002